2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

28 June 2010

Original: English

Summary record of the 16th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 28 May 2010, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Cabactulan (Philippines)

Contents

Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference *(continued)*

Credentials of representatives to the Conference *(continued)*

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee *(continued)*

Consideration and adoption of Final Document(s) *(continued)*

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

Any corrections to the record of this meeting and of other meetings will be issued in a corrigendum.

10-38001 (E)

Please recycle

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

Adoption of arrangements for meeting the costs of the Conference *(continued)* (NPT/CONF.2010/47)

1. **The President** drew attention to document NPT/CONF.2010/47 containing the schedule of division of costs based on the actual participation of States parties in the Conference. The document should be seen in conjunction with rule 12 of, and the appendix to, the rules of procedure adopted by the Conference on 3 May 2010. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the schedule of division of costs as contained in document NPT/CONF.2010/47.

2. *It was so decided.*

Credentials of representatives to the Conference *(continued)*

(b) Report of the Credentials Committee *(continued)* (NPT/CONF.2010/CC/1)

3. **Mr. Momen** (Bangladesh), Chairman of the Credentials Committee, introduced the final report of the Credentials Committee (NPT/CONF.2010/CC/1), which indicated that 98 States parties had submitted formal credentials, 74 had submitted provisional credentials and 18 had not submitted their credentials or any written notice that they would attend the Conference. Since the preparation of the report, formal credentials had been received from Belgium, the Republic of the Fiji Islands and the Republic of Mozambique, and an addendum would be issued to that effect. The Committee had decided to accept the credentials of all States parties participating in the Conference on the understanding that original credentials in the form required by rule 2 of the rules of procedure would be forwarded to the Secretary-General of the Conference as soon as possible.

4. **The President** took it that the Conference wished to take note of the report of the Credentials Committee.

5. *It was so decided.*

Consideration and adoption of Final Document(s) *(continued)* (NPT/CONF.2010/L.1 and L.2)

6. **The President** drew attention to the draft Final Document of the Conference, contained in document NPT/CONF.2010/L.2. He took it that the Conference first wished to take note of the section entitled "Review of the operation of the Treaty, as provided for in its article VIII (3), taking into account the decisions and the resolution adopted by the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference", which was recorded in the footnote as the President's reflection to the best of his knowledge of what transpired with regard to the matters of review. He also took it that the Conference wished to adopt the section entitled "Conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions".

7. *It was so decided.*

8. **The President** took it that the Conference next wished to adopt the draft Final Document, as contained in document NPT/CONF.2010/L.1, section by section.

9. *It was so decided.*

10. *The section entitled "Introduction" was adopted.*

11. *The section entitled "Organization of the Conference" was adopted.*

12. *The section entitled "Participation in the Conference" was adopted.*

13. *The section entitled "Financial arrangements" was adopted.*

14. *The section entitled "Work of the Conference" was adopted.*

15. *The section entitled "Documentation" was adopted.*

16. **The President** suggested that the wording of the section entitled "Conclusions of the Conference" should read as follows:

> "At its 16th and final plenary meeting, on 28 May 2010, the Conference considered the draft Final Document. The Conference took note of the 'Review of the operation of the Treaty, as provided for in its article VIII (3), taking into account the decisions and the resolution adopted by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference and the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference', which is recorded in the footnote as the President's reflection to the best of his knowledge of what transpired with regard to matters of review. The Conference adopted the 'Conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions'."

17. He took it that the Conference wished to adopt the section entitled "Conclusions of the Conference".

18. *It was so decided.*

19. **The President** took it that the Conference wished to adopt the draft Final Document as a whole, as contained in documents NPT/CONF.2010/L.1 and L.2.

20. *It was so decided.*

21. **Mr. Abdelaziz** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of Non-Aligned States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, welcomed the adoption of the Final Document as an important step towards achieving the goals of the Treaty. The negotiations held during the Review Conference had covered a wide range of issues that were critically important both for the credibility of the Treaty and for the security of its States parties.

22. Among the issues of vital importance for the full implementation of the Treaty, delegations had agreed on three forward-looking action plans; had reaffirmed the critical importance of the universality of the Treaty and the implementation of the resolution on the Middle East adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference; and had examined the need for a nuclear weapons convention for the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time frame, as well as a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances.

23. The Final Document just adopted provided a sound basis for continued cooperation among all States parties with a view to the early achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons. However, the outcome had not benefited greatly from the proposals submitted to the Conference by the Group in its relevant working papers, namely documents NPT/CONF.2010/WP.46 and WP.47. In that context, the Group would vigorously pursue the following goals in cooperation with all States parties: full implementation by the nuclear-weapon States of their disarmament commitments, with a view to the elimination of all nuclear weapons by 2025; universal adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and its objectives; and prompt commencement of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention and a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances. The Group would also continue to reaffirm the inalienable right of non-nuclear-weapon States parties to pursue the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without undue restrictions. In that respect, any voluntary arrangements and confidence-building measures entered into by States parties must not be confused with legally binding obligations under the Treaty.

24. The Group intended to work constructively with all concerned parties to promote a plan of action for the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. The Final Document, which reaffirmed the importance of Israel's accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and called on Israel to place all of its nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) comprehensive safeguards, confirmed the States parties' continued resolve to pursue the commitments given in 1995 and 2000 in that respect.

25. The adoption of the forward-looking outcome document clearly demonstrated that the Group of Non-Aligned States parties to the Treaty had shown a maximum degree of flexibility throughout the Conference negotiations. Though imperfect, the agreed package could be built upon and further enhanced in the near future. He invited all other States parties to join the Group in that important work.

26. **Mr. Salam** (Lebanon), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, welcomed the adoption of the Final Document, which the Group had approved without amendments in order to ensure the successful outcome of the Conference. Section IV of the document, in particular, provided a clear mechanism for Israel to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear-weapon State and to rid the Middle East of all weapons of mass destruction. He called on all delegations to move beyond narrow political views and to work together to build a better future for the Middle East.

27. **Mr. Aguirre de Cárcer** (Spain), speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the adoption of the Final Document by the Conference and underlined the willingness of the European Union to work towards the full implementation of the forward-looking action plans adopted pursuant to the three pillars of the Treaty and the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.

28. **Ms. Tauscher** (United States of America) said that over the past four weeks the parties to the Treaty had worked tirelessly to review its implementation and reaffirm the international consensus it embodied. Under the leadership of President Obama, the United States had reaffirmed its commitments to make progress towards nuclear disarmament and guarantee access to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes to all

those abiding by their non-proliferation commitments. The Treaty mattered because it was the principal international instrument holding parties accountable, discouraging proliferation and bringing the benefits of nuclear energy to all corners of the world.

29. The Final Document just adopted reflected the collective commitment to uphold and strengthen that cornerstone of the international non-proliferation regime and demonstrated the resolve to strengthen the Treaty's three pillars with the inclusion of recommendations for follow-on actions. It committed parties to work to achieve the vision to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons and recognized the steps the United States and others had taken to advance disarmament. It recognized the new agreement between the United States of America and the Russian Federation and reflected the shared interest in achieving deeper reductions of all types of nuclear weapons and their reduced role in the international system. It also encouraged the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and recognized the urgent need to get on with long-delayed talks on a fissile material cut-off treaty. It affirmed that the Additional Protocol and IAEA comprehensive safeguards agreements represented the standard for verification.

30. The Final Document emphasized that the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be made available to all parties in conformity with non-proliferation provisions, and recognized the importance of multilateral mechanisms for assurance of the nuclear fuel supply. It also highlighted the view of most that parties were to be held responsible for violations of the Treaty committed prior to withdrawal, and that consultations and actions by nuclear suppliers were needed to discourage abuse of the withdrawal provisions.

31. The Final Document also called on States to comply fully with the Treaty in order to uphold its integrity and the authority of its safeguards system. In that regard, Iran, the only country that had been found by the IAEA Board of Governors not to be in compliance with its nuclear safeguards obligations, had done nothing to enhance the confidence of the international community by its performance at the Review Conference.

32. The Final Document also included an agreement to hold a regional conference in 2012 to discuss issues relevant to a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems in the Middle East. Her Government had long supported such a zone, but recognized that essential precursors must be in place for its achievement. It would work with the countries in the region to create conditions for a successful conference, but its ability to do so had been seriously jeopardized because the final document singled out Israel in the section on the Middle East, a fact that the United States deeply regretted.

33. She also drew attention to the text concerning North Korea. The United States deplored North Korea's repeated defiance of international law and its international obligations and commitments. It should understand that it would never achieve security or acceptance by the international community without the complete and verified abandonment of its nuclear weapons programme. Its failure to implement its commitments under the Six-Party Talks to return to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and IAEA safeguards at an early date called into question the utility of negotiations. The Six-Party Talks could be an effective mechanism only if North Korea took early and irreversible steps to return to compliance with the Treaty and took action to establish its credibility as a negotiating partner.

34. Her delegation remained deeply grateful for the contributions that had resulted in a constructive outcome to the Review Conference. The hard work had just begun, however, as all parties were now charged with carrying out the commitments made.

35. **Mr. Danon** (France) said that his delegation welcomed the adoption of the Final Document, which included an ambitious road map for the revitalization of that essential Treaty. The adoption of the Final Document was a collective success for non-proliferation, disarmament and collective security, and demonstrated the attachment of the international community to the Treaty. While the plan of action was concrete and balanced, it was the view of his delegation that it should have gone further in respect of proliferation activities in the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Words were not sufficient; the time had come for action on responsible civilian uses of nuclear energy and mobilization for disarmament.

36. **Mr. Cheng** Jingye (China) said that after 10 years, the 2010 Review Conference had once again achieved

a substantial result that would strengthen the effectiveness, authority and universality of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. He expressed the hope that the Final Document would be implemented effectively.

37. His delegation wished to emphasize the need for thorough and complete destruction of nuclear weapons and its support for a treaty on that subject. It also supported the negotiation of an internationally binding agreement on negative security assurances and, within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament, the early negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty as the only effective way to control such material. It would also promote the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and its early entry into force. China supported the recommendations contained in the Final Document, especially those pertaining to the Middle East.

38. **Mr. Antonov** (Russian Federation) said that despite doubts about a positive outcome, the 2010 Review Conference had added a page to the history of the Non-Proliferation Treaty by adopting a clear, future-oriented plan of action for non-proliferation, disarmament and development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. For the first time in the 15 years since the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, the Review Conference had set forth concrete measures for joint efforts on a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems in the Middle East.

39. Four weeks of discussion had shown that the Treaty continued to be a cornerstone of the international security system and a key element in halting proliferation and advancing disarmament. Next steps included ratification of the new agreement between the Russian Federation and the United States of America on strategic arms reduction and its implementation, as well as the implementation of the decisions taken at the Review Conference. Progress in disarmament would lead to increased stability and security. The security of all countries was indivisible; only together could a world free of nuclear weapons be achieved.

40. **Mr. van den IJssel** (Netherlands) said that his delegation wished to align itself with the statement made by the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union. With regard to the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, his delegation would have preferred a more balanced text regarding the challenges in the region. It hoped to contribute to the efforts to establish a zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

41. **Mr. Benmehidi** (Algeria) said that the 2010 Review Conference had taken place at a time when the international climate had been conducive to producing an agreement and new momentum. Nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States alike had gathered to renew their partnership for a more secure world. The agreement regarding the 1995 resolution on the Middle East after 15 years of inaction was a major achievement, and he commended the Arab Group for the constructive spirit it had brought to the negotiations. Nuclear weapons were the most dangerous threat to the world, and their total elimination was the main objective of the Treaty.

42. **Mr. Suda** (Japan) said that the negotiations leading to the adoption of the Final Document had been difficult, but flexibility and cooperation had been shown by all delegations. Initiatives by the United States and other nuclear-weapon States had paved the way to agreement. Agreement on action plans on all three pillars of the Treaty was unprecedented. The emphasis on transparency and IAEA additional protocols and safeguards agreements was welcome.

43. The Final Document did not meet expectations in one area, however. Unfortunately, there was no mention of a moratorium on production and testing of fissile material. A group of survivors of the nuclear explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki had been following the deliberations at the Conference with interest; that outcome was not satisfactory to them.

44. **Mr. Duncan** (United Kingdom), welcomed the breakthrough achieved by the Review Conference after a decade of stalemate. The adoption of the Final Document, particularly the unprecedented agreement on all three pillars of the Treaty, demonstrated the international community's continued commitment to overcome traditional divisions in a spirit of shared interest, cooperation and partnership. In that context, he encouraged all sides to make further progress to implement the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.

45. On a separate matter, he noted that paragraph 118 of document NPT/CONF.2010/L.2 was unfortunately an inaccurate reference to paragraph 12 of decision 2 of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference. He also noted that paragraph 118 should be interpreted without prejudice to the rights of States parties to the peaceful

uses of nuclear energy pursuant to article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

46. **Mr. Benítez Verson** (Cuba) said that the Review Conference had been an ideal opportunity for the international community to move forward after many years of inaction. However, the final outcome of the Conference was mixed: the conclusions and recommendations adopted included modest progress but far from what was required. An enormous gap remained between the good intentions expressed repeatedly by the nuclear-weapon States and the concrete steps that they were actually willing to take.

47. He regretted the fact that a consensus document had not been adopted aimed at reviewing the implementation of the Treaty, since the language adopted in that respect reflected only the views of the President of the Conference. His delegation wished to stress that the procedure adopted at the Conference with regard to the review process must not set a precedent for future practice.

48. While the adopted plan of action on nuclear disarmament contained positive elements, it was nevertheless limited and inadequate. Many of the specific proposals put forward by Cuba and the Group of Non-Aligned States parties, including a clearly defined timetable for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by 2025, had been reflected in the Final Document only as vague aspirations. Other shortcomings in the document included its failure to refer to the need for immediate negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention; the lack of a clear commitment by nuclear-weapon States to cease the development of nuclear weapons; the failure to call for the immediate removal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States; and the omission of clear commitments from the nuclear-weapon States to provide legally binding negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States.

49. The step-by-step approach promoted by some, which had been used to dilute much of the language of the Final Document, should not serve as a pretext for preserving the status quo. The results of the Conference had shown that much progress remained to be achieved in order to implement all of the provisions of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. To that end, he called on the international community to work together to finally rid the world of all nuclear weapons.

50. **Mr. Spindelegger** (Austria) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the Final Document because it considered the Non-Proliferation Treaty to be the cornerstone of the non-proliferation regime and wished to make a positive contribution to the current momentum towards disarmament. It welcomed the progress made towards establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and also welcomed the action plan on nuclear disarmament, which contained a strong package of concrete goals and measures that could be used to monitor further progress over the next review cycle.

51. He also wished to point out paragraph 56 and actions 37, 38, 39, 57 and 63 of document NPT/CONF.2010/1/2 would be implemented in accordance with the Federal Constitution of Austria. Like many other States, Austria had no interest in nuclear power applications and thus would not be involved in the development of new nuclear reactors.

52. **Mr. Soltanieh** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that nuclear weapons posed the most immediate danger to humanity and should be prohibited under international humanitarian law. Moreover, the possession of such destructive and indiscriminate weapons should be condemned by the international community rather than condoned. Accordingly, any increase in nuclear weapons capability should equal a reduction in political credibility.

53. There had been high expectations among the international community that, following the missed opportunities of the past decade, the 2010 Review Conference would adopt urgent practical steps to eliminate nuclear weapons within a specific timeline. However, certain nuclear-weapon States had unfortunately remained unwilling even to reaffirm their previous undertakings agreed at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences. It was regrettable that the Final Document had failed to incorporate some of the fundamental principles established at the previous Review Conferences.

54. For example, the text of the Final Document had significantly watered down the commitments for nuclear-weapon States to reduce the operational status of their arsenals and to cease the development and qualitative improvement of their nuclear weapons. It did not oblige the nuclear-weapon States to abolish the role of nuclear weapons in their military doctrines or to accept a legally binding instrument for the prohibition

of nuclear weapons, it did not call for the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States, it did not include the specific timeline for the total elimination of nuclear weapons called for by the Group of Non-Aligned States parties to the Treaty, and, in particular, it failed to call upon Israel, the only obstacle to a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, to cease the development of nuclear weapons and to accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty without preconditions.

55. While numerous other examples could be cited to demonstrate the shortcomings of the Final Document, the limited achievements of the 2010 Review Conference could nevertheless be seen as a step forward on the path towards total nuclear disarmament. Thus, the Islamic Republic of Iran, which had joined the consensus to show political goodwill and its respect for the views of others, was determined to work actively alongside the other non-nuclear-weapon States not only for the full implementation of the decisions agreed at the 2010 Review Conference, but also for the adoption of further practical steps commensurate with the high expectations of the international community.

56. **Mr. Woolcott** (Australia) welcomed the adoption by the 2010 Review Conference of a substantive final outcome document, which contained a wide-ranging and forward-looking plan of action across the three pillars of the Non-Proliferation Treaty that built upon the results of the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences. All delegations had shown a commendable spirit of cooperation and a readiness to compromise, which had been crucial to the success of the Conference. At the same time, his delegation would have liked the nuclear-weapon States to observe an immediate moratorium on the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and had also hoped that those States would enhance the transparency of their nuclear disarmament efforts. It had also expected a stronger outcome on measures to strengthen the IAEA safeguards system and would therefore continue to work to build greater consensus on that issue in the coming years.

57. **Mr. García Moritán** (Argentina) said that the flexibility shown by all States parties in the negotiations which had permitted the adoption of the Final Document was to be commended. It represented significant progress over the final document of the 2000 Review Conference and provided a concrete and constructive plan to guide States parties in their work towards implementation of the commitments assumed. The role of IAEA had been strengthened and action on peaceful uses of nuclear energy could also be expected in coming years. The conference on the zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, to be held in 2012 with the United Nations Secretary-General as the facilitator, was also a major step forward.

58. **Mr. Dabbashi** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that despite its reservations, his delegation could live with the Final Document adopted by the Review Conference. It would have hoped that the text would deal with the commitments of the nuclear-weapon States under article VI of the Treaty by setting timelines for disarmament and the negotiation of a treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, as well as a mechanism to verify reductions in nuclear arsenals, but those proposals had been strongly opposed by the nuclear-weapon States. Unfortunately, lack of action in those areas would delay the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the primary objective of the Treaty. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya would be looking at ways to amend the Treaty to provide for verification in nuclear-weapon States.

59. It was regrettable that the major Powers applied double standards to suit their national agendas. There was no mention of certain countries, while others were singled out. No country was above the law and immune to criticism, however. His delegation had joined the consensus despite the way the Final Document addressed Israel. He hoped that Israel would be encouraged to join the Treaty and attend the 2012 conference as a non-nuclear-weapon State.

60. **Mr. Minty** (South Africa) said that his delegation saw a need for the 2010 Review Conference to build towards a new consensus that balanced the three pillars of the Treaty. Essential elements of such a consensus would include an undertaking on nuclear disarmament, transparency, implementation of the "13 practical steps" from the 2000 Conference, negative security assurances, a fissile material cut-off treaty and strengthened IAEA safeguards. The Final Document fell short of expectations, but his delegation had joined consensus in order to strengthen the Treaty after the limited progress made during the past decade. The 2010 Review Conference would only be judged a success, however, if the commitments made were implemented.

61. **Mr. Labbé** (Chile) said that the adoption of the Final Document reaffirmed the Treaty and sent a positive signal to the entire multilateral system. Although the content of the Final Document was far from perfect, it kept alive the hope of a world free of nuclear weapons. The regions where nuclear-weapon-free zones had been established were pleased that their message had been heard and incorporated into the fabric of the review process. He also acknowledged the active presence of civil society and the dedication and conviction of the men and women representing the many organizations participating in the Conference.

62. **Mr. Grinius** (Canada), noting that the President had described the Final Document just adopted as the best that could be offered and as offering the seeds of hope, said that his delegation expressed its full support for that document. Its conclusions and recommendations went further towards the strengthening of the three pillars of the Treaty than ever before. There had also been progress in strengthening the Treaty review process. His delegation had hoped to see a substantive outcome and to start to build a Treaty support system to help the Treaty achieve its aims, but full consensus had not been possible. He expected that States would continue to do what they could to strengthen the reform of the Treaty review process. Despite the setback with respect to reform, Canada understood that there were larger forces at play, and would work to support the entire Final Document and follow-on actions and to move reform forward.

63. **Mr. Macedo** (Mexico) said that the text adopted, while it did not represent perfection, would move the world further away from nuclear war. He noted in particular the commitment of the nuclear-weapon States to discuss disarmament among themselves and to inform the parties of measures they planned to take to rid the world of such weapons. The Review Conference had been able to send a united message to the international community regarding nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

64. **Mr. Kleib** (Indonesia) said that the disappointments of past Review Conferences had not held back progress at the 2010 Conference because of the political courage displayed by many States parties. The Final Document was a new beginning and offered enough balance to bring all groups on board to a consensus. The international community must seize the moment and work to implement all the commitments it contained.

65. **Mr. Pham** Vinh Quang (Viet Nam), speaking on behalf of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), associated himself with the statement made by the Group of Non-Aligned States parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and welcomed the adoption of the Final Document.

66. **Mr. de Macedo Soares** (Brazil) said that the balanced Final Document adopted by the Conference provided a good basis to move forward. The international community must build on the favourable international environment and the successful outcome of the 2010 Review Conference to pursue disarmament efforts in all other relevant bodies, starting with the adoption of a programme of work by the Conference on Disarmament.

67. Speaking on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, he expressed the Coalition's belief that its efforts since the preparatory work for the Conference had yielded tangible results in the area of nuclear disarmament.

68. **Mr. Reyes Rodriguez** (Colombia) said that, following 10 years of paralysis, the adoption of the Final Document by the Conference was extremely welcome. His delegation also wished to stress that actions 36, 44 and 45 clearly set forth the responsibilities of States with respect to those individuals and entities engaged in terrorist activities.

69. **Mr. Hart** (Nigeria) said that the successful outcome of the 2010 Review Conference had been influenced by the favourable international environment, which demonstrated what could be achieved with sufficient political will, shared values and common interests. The international community should now capitalize on that unity to further promote and strengthen the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

70. **Mr. Kongstad** (Norway) welcomed the successful outcome of the 2010 Review Conference, which had been essential for the credibility of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. While his delegation had hoped for more ambitious action on all three pillars, including specific timelines for disarmament and stronger non-proliferation efforts, it recognized that the best possible action plan had been adopted at the current juncture. All delegations should be commended for their considerable willingness to compromise, especially in view of the consensus achieved on the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.

71. **Mr. Im** Han-taek (Republic of Korea) said that the significant outcome of the current Review Conference would dispel any lingering doubts about the future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and would pave the way for a world free of nuclear weapons. His delegation particularly welcomed the unified stance of the Conference with regard to the nuclear issue in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which posed a serious threat to the international community.

72. **Ms. Ancidey** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) welcomed the adoption of the Final Document, which represented an important step towards the long-term goal of a world free of nuclear weapons. In that connection, her delegation hoped to see further progress in 2012 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

73. While the States parties had achieved practical results at the 2010 Review Conference, their work remained incomplete, particularly since the nuclear-weapon States had not agreed to a specific timetable for complete nuclear disarmament or to provide legally binding negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States. She particularly regretted the fact that agreement had not been reached to review the implementation of the Treaty and hoped that subsequent Review Conferences would be more successful in that respect.

74. **Mr. Hassan** (Sudan) said that the adoption of the Final Document by consensus represented progress towards the implementation of the Treaty. He hoped that the successful outcome of the Conference would be an incentive for the swift implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East, and that the coming five years would see progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

75. **Mr. Seruhere** (United Republic of Tanzania) reiterated his delegation's support for the three pillars of the Treaty and expressed the hope that momentum for its implementation would be maintained. States parties must continue their dialogue on the Secretary-General's five-point plan. South Africa stood as a good example of a country that had eliminated its nuclear arsenal, and the international community should make use of its experience.

76. **Mr. Duarte** (United Nations High Representative for Disarmament Affairs) read out a message from the Secretary-General, who welcomed the successful outcome of the 2010 Review Conference, which had adopted an action plan to advance nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy over the next five years. A strong spirit of compromise and cooperation had delivered a significant agreement to build a safer and more secure world.

77. He congratulated the President of the Conference and commended the States parties for finding common ground to further strengthen the Treaty as the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation towards nuclear disarmament.

78. The action plan laid a solid foundation to further strengthen the Treaty and address the challenges ahead. The agreement on concrete actions would advance all three pillars of the Treaty — disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful use of nuclear energy. He welcomed the firm commitment of the nuclear-weapon States to advance their efforts to eliminate all nuclear weapons and the strong commitment of the States parties to prevent nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism.

79. The Secretary-General looked forward to the cooperation of the States parties as he followed through on the initiatives outlined in the Final Document. In that regard, he particularly welcomed the agreement on a process leading to full implementation of the 1995 resolution on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

80. The Secretary-General encouraged States parties to translate all of their commitments into concrete action. He looked forward to working with the international community towards realizing the common goal of a world without nuclear weapons and would spare no effort to assist the States parties in implementing their agreement.

81. **The President** said that the States parties had agreed on a Final Document, and over the four weeks of negotiations had achieved a better understanding of each other's positions and a clear appreciation of the need to strengthen further the main pillars of the Treaty. The potent spirit of cooperation and the desire of all participants for success had sustained and increased the global momentum towards one day freeing humanity from the scourge of nuclear weapons.

82. *The President declared the 2010 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons closed.*

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.